

**REMARKS**

The Office Action of November 23, 2005, and the cited art have been carefully considered. The application has been amended to eliminate unnecessary limitations and to correct grammatical and similar errors. Reconsideration of the rejection of the application is respectfully requested based on the amendments and following discussion.

Applicants' invention is for a plastic lamp base, such as one used with an automotive discharge lamp that emits destructive UV radiation. Similar lamps have been previously protected with relatively massive ceramic shields. The material cost and bulk of these massive shields have made them undesirable. At the same time an effective UV shield needs to be heat and radiation tolerant and electrically non-conductive. An oxidized or nitrided metal coating has been found to be inexpensive, mechanically non-interfering and electrically non-conducting.

Claims 1 - 2 remain in the application.

Claim 1 has been amended as to reflect its scale as a coating.

Claims 3, 4 and 5 have been canceled.

**OBJECTIONS:**

The drawings were objected to for failing to show the three layers described in the claims.

The claims referencing the multiple layers have been canceled.

The title was objected as not being descriptive.

The title has been amended.

**REJECTION 102:**

1. Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Wittig US 5,428,261

Wittig '261 shows relatively massive ceramic shield in the form of a separate part that is attached to a plastic base by ultra-sonic welding. Such a part is pre-cast and sintered, and must have sufficient bulk to mechanically withstand the assembly-line

process and attachment to the plastic base. While Wittig '261 does not specify the thickness of this ceramic part, it is obvious to one skilled in the art that the part is not a coating. Further, such a part with a thickness of 1 micron would be far too fragile to be practical in such an assembly.

Wittig '261 fails to provide a prima facie case of invalidity under 35 USC 102, since Wittig '261 fails to show, suggest, state or claim a limitation included in Applicants' claims. Wittig '261 fails to teach a "...*radiation protective coating formed from a compound of a metal and oxygen and/or nitrogen having a coating thickness of approximately one micron*". Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the rejected claims are therefore respectfully requested.

#### REJECTION 103:

2. Claims 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC 103 over Wittig '261 in view of Karras US 6,887,354.

Claims 3 and 5 have been canceled.

3. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 USC 103 over Wittig '261 in view of Karras US 6,887,354 and Gillery US 4,017,661.

Claim 4 has been canceled.

Karras '354 shows a process for applying a coating to a lamp capsule. There is no suggestion to use a radiation protective coating formed on a plastic base. Whether the disclosed process and materials in Karras '354 could be effectively attached to a plastic base to shield it from UV radiation is speculation. Such a result is not made obvious by the reference.

Gillery '661 shows a transparent, electrically conductive coating formed on a glass window. The purpose is to allow transmission of light through the coating and window, and to allow electric current to flow through the coating to heat the window. This is contrary to the present application where the purpose is to block light transmission to protect the plastic base. Being light transmissive does not teach being light blocking. Further, since discharge lamps use very high starting voltages and frequently high operating voltages, it is unadvisable to provide an electrically conductive surface around the lamp leads. Such a conductive surface could serve as a shorting path. One skilled in the art would not use the suggest coating material in Gillery '661 to shield a plastic base

from destructive radiation, or as a short circuit block in a high voltage product. Gillery '661 does not make the claimed structure obvious.

It is believed that a full and complete response to the Office Action has been made, that the Application as amended is patentably distinct over the cited art, and that the case is now in condition to be passed to issue. Reconsideration of the amended application is therefore requested, and an early favorable notice of allowance is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: William E. Meyer

William E. Meyer

Reg. No. 30,719

Attorney for Applicants

OSRAM SYLVANIA INC.

100 ENDICOTT STREET

DANVERS, MA 01923

(978) 750-2384

(978) 750-2045 FAX